



COPIES OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

GP/38

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7/ Response
J. Steptoe
6-25-02

Applicant: EPPES et al. Examiner: Nguyen, J.
Serial No.: 09/585,921 ✓ Group Art Unit: 2858
Filed: June 2, 2000 Docket No.: AMDA.478PA
Title: INTEGRATED CIRCUIT INTERNAL HEATING SYSTEM
AND METHOD

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this communication is being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on May 23, 2002.

By:

Kelly S. Waltigney
Kelly S. Waltigney

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

JUN 11 2002

RECEIVED

OFFICE ACTION RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2002.

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the following reasons set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The Office Action mailed April 5, 2002 indicated that: claims 1, 2 and 8 stand rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Goruganthu et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 6,281,029); claims 22-31 stand rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Birdsley* (U. S. Patent No. 6,255,124); and claims 3-7, 9-13 and 15-21 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over *Goruganthu et al.* in view of *Birdsley*. Furthermore, claim 14 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (there are no intervening claims).

With respect to the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 8, Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(e) rejection and submits that the § 102(e) rejection is improper because the